



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ference. Still, as we read the extracts from his writings which his grandson with excellent judgment has spread before us, we see that he was really no partisan, but an independent man. We find expressions of regret and distrust uttered by him about some of the men whom his party was compelled to carry with it. His allegiance was that of a man who must choose between one of two parties on general principles, and on a few grounds of decided conviction. We therefore close the volumes with a grateful impression of the man and of his career. His Life, and the inscription which it bears, are a most valuable contribution to our national monument.

ART. IX.—*History of New England.* By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1858. Vol. I. pp. 636.

THE Transatlantic reproach cast upon the superficialness of American scholarship and authorship can be in no wise affected by our simple denial of the charge, nor yet can it be extenuated by our partial admission of it with grounds of justification. It has already become somewhat stale, solely because, since our national self-complacency was first disturbed by it, our soil has been growing more and more prolific of scholars and writers who could not fail of an English reputation. Yet there are departments of learning in which we must, no doubt, remain for the present in the rear of our European contemporaries, for want of adequate libraries, of a proper division of intellectual labor, and of endowments for the support and encouragement of those who make it their life-work to add to the world's stock of knowledge. Thus in regard to the entire study and science of language we are placed at a disadvantage which cannot be easily overcome, except by extended foreign residence or travel; for philology, equally with zoölogy or astronomy, must be based on observation and comparison; and the philologist is in most of our public libraries as destitute of materials for the prosecution of his inquiries, as a zoölogist would be in a thronged city, or an astronomer under an always clouded sky.

These considerations are not necessarily a bar to the highest eminence in the department of modern history. Here, indeed, our public libraries are deficient, even in works relating to our own country, of which there is at least one private citizen who has a much more valuable collection than is possessed by any State or college. Nor yet is there any considerable chapter of history which can be properly studied without first-hand access to state-papers in the keeping of European governments. Yet the historian may cross the Atlantic with all the questions for which he needs an answer ready shaped to his mind, may know precisely what he requires to consult, and where, and he may thus bring home memoranda and transcripts which shall be the full and sufficient supplement of what he can gather from our own collections and archives. Moreover, it accords with all experience, though we know not how to generalize the law of human nature to which it should be referred, that he who must travel far for his authorities sifts them more warily and thoroughly than he who has them but an arm's length from him. It cannot be denied, that among our historical writers there are some, at least, who have no superiors in breadth of comprehension, thoroughness of execution, and force, precision, and elegance of style. The list we indeed might feel disposed to shorten from that which has sometimes appeared on our pages in past years. We have been too ready to receive bulkiness as synonymous with greatness, and have occasionally manifested more pride in a series of ponderous octavos than their contents would warrant.

Yet, whether we include more or fewer names in our catalogue of American historians who belong to the foremost rank, there can be only unanimous consent in assigning the first place among those who have given us finished works to him who has been so recently summoned out of the world with his master-work unfinished. In Prescott, we hardly know whether most to admire his indefatigable industry in collecting materials from so various and distant sources, his complete mastery and unchallenged criticism of his authorities, his exquisite method, his vivid reproduction of personages and transactions, or his unstudied dignity and spontaneous grace of style and diction. For our own part, we have been most of

all impressed by the imaginative power which makes his narrative like that of a contemporary and eyewitness, so that we forget for the time the author's personality, and seem to be reading the pages of one whose national sympathies are identified with this or that party in the drama which he causes to pass before us,—except that in the shifting of these sympathies as the scales of justice change their poise, we are made again to feel that he is always the compatriot of those whose is the right cause or the wrong suffering. Of the virtues which made him — what the great historian, no less than the true orator, must be — a pre-eminently good man, we trust that the day is not far distant when an adequate memorial may be given to the public; in which event we will hope to transfer to our pages some not unworthy likeness of one whose name will be held in long regret, and in enduring reverence and love.

It is a noteworthy coincidence, that the press of this city should have issued almost simultaneously the last volume of hitherto our greatest historian, and the first volume of one who promises to add to not dissimilar claims upon our gratitude the added title of the first historiographer, in any worthy sense, of his and our native New England. With strong points of difference, there are not a few of close resemblance between Prescott and Dr. Palfrey. They are alike in their minuteness and thoroughness of investigation, in their unimpassioned impartiality of narrative, in their accurate presentation of remoter historical causes and more recondite motives, in their independence of commonplaces and conventionalities in their judgment of men and transactions, in their constant reference to an elevated standard of right, and in gravity, purity, and precision of style. Prescott is the more dramatic of the two; but Dr. Palfrey, by the distinctness of his delineation, by the perfect proportions of his narrative, and by a quality closely analogous to the *chiaro scuro* of a sister art, which strikingly characterizes all that he has ever written, throws equal life into history, and makes it equally the presentation to the inward eye of the scenes and events of an earlier time. Prescott's descriptions are faithful word-paintings; Dr. Palfrey's remind us of a colorless transparency. The difference is to be in part ascribed to native temperament;

in part, to their respective subjects. The one has wrought in regions redolent of romantic associations, among memorials of vanished greatness, and upon scenes and characters remote from our familiar knowledge and ready sympathy ; the other, on what was a *rasa tabula* for his pencil, among the monuments of our own ancestry, and upon personages and events blended with all that we are, and daily witness, and constantly experience. Their differences thus merge themselves in that broader resemblance, in which the manner of each is closely adapted to his work ; and we believe that neither could have been so entirely successful in the other's field of labor.

Dr. Palfrey manifests rare gifts as an historian. First of all, he loves his subject. A New England man as thoroughly in character as veritably by right of birth, he inherits the principles which presided in the inception of our republican institutions,— the fearless integrity, the persistent adherence to the right, the uncompromising independence, the tenacity of honest purpose, the ardent love of liberty, which were the gerinal principles of these Northeastern Colonies, and which have been transplanted with our emigrant population through the entire breadth of our continent. His conscientious and painstaking industry was needed, not so much for the narration of actual events on this side of the ocean, as for the often obscure and difficult investigation of their Transatlantic causes and relations. His candor is signally conspicuous in dealing with matters in which varying opinions and interests have transmitted sectional and party strife, not indeed in the form of animosity, but of fixed historical prejudice, to the descendants of the principal actors. His minuteness of narration leaves at no point a reasonable curiosity unsatisfied ; and yet he has the rare art of multiplying details without magnifying them, so that the salient topics of interest are never overlaid or dwarfed by the pressure of collateral and subsidiary material. Then, too, the work is equally fitted for the simply receptive reader and the critical student of history. The text presents an unbroken flow of easy narrative ; while in the copious notes all points of controversy are elaborately discussed, discrepancies between different authorities carefully noted, and full references given.

The settlement of New England presents for the historian a theme second to none in interest and magnitude, as regards its antecedents and its results. Its epoch was, politically and spiritually, at once a harvest season and a seed-time,— the ingathering of the mere handful of thoroughly matured seed-corn to be sown forthwith in the virgin soil of the New World. In saying this, we ascribe to our fathers superiority over the men of their times only in what the stern discipline of persecution and suffering could create and cherish; in such seals of a divine and world-wide mission as are but transfigured wound-marks; in tendencies toward freedom, not the result of profounder reasoning or insight or foresight than belonged to their age, but of an experience so shaped as to teach no other lesson. They were as narrow in their religious sympathies as they were fervent in their piety; but a Providence higher than their thoughts, deeper than their plans, so shaped their course that they became inevitable pioneers of the very liberty of conscience and of worship which they disallowed.

It seems to human view surprising that these regions of North America should not have been colonized at an earlier period. Whatever measure of authenticity may be awarded to the narratives of discovery by the Northmen, it is certain that they had the requisite ability and enterprise to reach our coasts, and to make permanent settlements upon them; and the same hardihood, thirst for adventure, and zeal for maritime exploration, which with the Southern nations of Europe found occupation in the East, if directed westward, must have planted these shores with an immigrant population before the invention of the art of printing. But had the discovery and planting of North America preceded this invention, the needs and straitnesses of forest life and savage warfare, the entire separation from all that could serve for example and instruction, and the absence of all means for embodying and circulating intelligence, would have so rapidly deteriorated the immigrant races, that it would have taken centuries to retrieve the degradation which would have reached its lowest possible point within fifty years from the landing of any company of colonists. Equally unpropitious would have been the settle-

ment of our country before the Protestant Reformation aroused the European mind from its slumber of ages. In that case, superstition must have been for generations growing more sombre, ignorance more crass and impenetrable, Romanism more like feticism, before the light that rose in the East could have found its way across the ocean; and the states that have been formed from Spanish America are types of what our whole continent must of necessity have been, had the veil that rested on the Western World been prematurely lifted.

We believe, with Dr. Palfrey, that the leading minds of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay Colonies brought with them principles and maxims of government, and of individual rights, which could have no other embodiment than in republican institutions. There was an essential connection between Puritanism and civil freedom. The Puritan had so pervading and intense a perception of his accountability to God for fidelity to the dictates of his individual conscience, that he could not be the passive subject of arbitrary power. The question with him was that of the safety or perdition of his soul, and it was too heavy a stake to be put at hazard by kings or courts. He owned no lawgiver but the Supreme Ruler of the universe, and could submit to no sway exercised independently of his will. The limitation of the elective franchise and of participation in the government of the state to church-members, was but the natural expression of this sentiment. An ungodly populace was as dangerous to the rights of an enlightened conscience as an ungodly king. Those only were fit to rule who had in common a lowly reverence for the law of God, and who would unite in the endeavor to make that law paramount. The example of separation between things secular and things sacred in the functions of government had not yet been witnessed, nor had the possibility of such a separation entered into the minds of men. Every European sovereign was virtually the *Pontifex Maximus*, and enforced equally modes of worship and forms of civil order and obedience. All the abuses under the European governments of which the Puritans had reason to complain, resulted from the usurpation of the rightful functions of the church by the state. The obvious remedy was to reverse that vicious order of things,

and to subjugate the state to the church. The form in which this idea was incorporated into the civil organizations of New England was impracticable, except for a short period and on a limited scale; for it involved the supremacy, not of conscientious, God-fearing men in the aggregate, but of those who had received a certain religious brand, for which some of the best citizens might well lack the prerequisites, and of which some of the worst citizens might feign the demanded conditions. But the idea is none the less sound, and its fit embodiment will mark the culmination of true liberty,—the condition in which men shall be free in every direction in which they shall not find themselves restrained as the servants of God. Government can approach perfection only in the degree in which the law of God shall be the basis and the limit of human legislation.

But while the Puritans were thus of necessity the pioneers of civil freedom, they were the only religionists who could lay any title to this distinction. The Roman Pontiff claimed a civil no less than an ecclesiastical control over the members of the Church which owned him as its head, and thus no Roman Catholic state could regulate its own affairs without the interference of a power, which indeed could wield directly but little physical strength, but which was mighty in the factitious thunder of its spiritual censures, and by means of them could command the armies of the faithful to enforce its behests. The English Church acknowledged the authority of the state over the most sacred concerns of the individual conscience, and was, under the Stuarts, the mere sycophantic slave of the crown; while at the same time the Romanistic tendencies of the reigning family were so manifest, as to render the retrogression to Catholicism a subject of just apprehension, especially as this had taken place so disastrously under the first female heir of the house. The Anabaptists, and the various denominations of sectaries that were offshoots from the Puritan stock, were more or less tinctured with an Antinomianism, whose natural fruit was anarchy, not liberty. They disowned with greater or less distinctness the amenableness of the saints to the Divine law, and were therefore unsafe subjects of a government,

which lightened all other yokes that it might sustain the equitable and benignant pressure of that yoke which is perfect freedom.

On no score have our ancestors suffered severer reproach, than on account of their intolerance of religious dissent and their exclusion of dissenters. If there be truth in what we have said, this policy admits of defence on political grounds, on the exigencies of public safety. The Puritan settlers were not numerous or strong enough to cope with an organized opposition. Of those who were severely dealt with, there were hardly any who did not invite offensive measures against themselves by aggressions against the existing order, by licentious practices, seditious speeches, or open contempt of the constituted authorities. There were indeed instances — fewer than is commonly represented — in which gratuitous cruelties indicated the *odium theologicum*, and our fathers would not have been men of their century had they been wholly emancipated from such influences. But in the large majority of cases the obnoxious religionists were merely sent back to the mother country, or banished under such penalties as were deemed necessary to render their exile permanent. This was the right, nay, more, the duty, of the guardians of our infant republics. They were not in a condition to temporize, to harbor smothered rebellion, to nourish in their bosom potential enemies to the rights they had so dearly purchased. They had not in their body politic sufficient vitality to absorb and assimilate heterogeneous elements. Surrounded by a savage foe, poor in the means of defence, they could be secure only in union. They could safely keep in their society only those whom they could make partners. We by no means assert that they could have themselves offered this plea. In times of emergency an instinctive perception of need supplies the place of sober ratiocination; but what honest men at such seasons feel to be right, will generally bear the test of reasoning, and we believe that, for measures which have been deemed oppressive, and which in many minds have left a stigma upon the fathers of New England, the imminent necessities of their infant state were far oftener than religious bigotry and hatred the prevailing motive.

This must have been especially the case as regards the treatment of professed members of the Church of England by the authorities of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The Plymouth planters were voluntarily separatists, and in their residence in the Netherlands may have lost all remaining sympathy with the religious order of their mother country. But the Bay colonists were almost all of them loving and loyal members and ministers of the Church of England, as to the essentials of her doctrine and her ritual, driven from her enclosure solely by the arbitrary imposition upon them of observances and compliances against which her leading divines under Edward VI, her martyrs under Queen Mary, would have been equally strenuous. Winthrop and his associates say in their parting address from the ship in which they had embarked: "We esteem it our honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother, and cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes." Had there not been a stubborn determination on the part of the court and the primate to enforce conformity to rites and practices which bore the trail of Romanism, Boston would probably have remained unsettled till Plymouth had become strong enough to colonize it. The early citizens and magistrates of Boston could therefore have had no hostility to members of the Anglican Establishment as such. They were unwilling to permit its public ministrations, for the very reason for which they had forsaken them in England, and for the added reason that a rival form of worship involved the raising up of a rival faction in civil and political affairs. But we see no evidence that an English Churchman was ever persecuted here for his adherence to the Church. Those for whom recent writers have claimed in this behalf the honors of a semi-martyrdom, were most of them persons of profligate characters, such men as "leave their country for their country's good," and the residue were sent to England or banished from the jurisdiction on account of political offences.

The period covered by Dr. Palfrey's first volume closes before the intrusion of Quakerism upon the stage of New

England history. That our fathers transcended the outside limits of mercy in dealing with this heresy, it would be vain for us to deny; but it must be admitted that the early Quakers equally transcended the outside limits of decency, and merited whatever measure of restraint or punishment should be visited on atrocious breaches of the public peace, and violations of all natural and conventional laws of modesty and reverence. Nor have we any reason to suppose that the quiet profession of such opinions as distinguished the followers of Fox and Penn would have been deemed worthy of any penalty other than the negative one of disfranchisement.

The portion of his volume in which Dr. Palfrey will meet with the severest historical criticism is that which relates to Roger Williams, whose undoubted integrity of purpose, purity of life, and services as the founder of a State, have won for him a traditional sympathy well-nigh universal, and have been so regarded and represented as to cast deep reproach on the memory of the magistrates and divines of the Bay Colony. The first and essential point, which should be taken into consideration, is that Williams was not punished as a Baptist; for he was not a Baptist till several years after his banishment. We find no proof that he was regarded or treated as a heretic, except in certain matters in which his religious opinions had a direct bearing on the authority of the magistrates and the execution of the laws. His sentence of banishment recites no other charge against him than his having "broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions against the authority of magistrates, as also writ letters of defamation both of the magistrates and churches here." He signalized his entrance into the Colony by denying the right of the magistrates to punish "breaches of the first table" of the Decalogue, namely, idolatry, perjury, blasphemy, and Sabbath-breaking, against the three last of which penalties still stand on the statute-book of Massachusetts, while perjury is a penal offence under every known government. He publicly disputed the right of the colonists to their soil under the King's patent. He taught that it was unlawful to administer an oath to an unre-

generate person,— a doctrine which, so far as it was admitted, involved judicial proceedings in inextricable embarrassment. He urged his church in Salem to renounce all communion with the other churches of the Colony; and when they rejected his advice, he withdrew himself from their communion, and also from that of his own wife in the services of family devotion, inasmuch as she still adhered to the fellowship of the church. This procedure was by no means harmless in a civil point of view, as the church-members were *ipso facto* citizens, and his proposed measure was tantamount to a secession of the inhabitants of Salem from the body politic of which they were a component part. As a disturber of the peace he was exiled. The sentence, passed September 3, 1635, was to take effect within six weeks; but, as this would have sent him into the wilderness on the verge of winter, a reprieve was granted him till the following spring. He made so good use of the liberty thus allowed him in maintaining the excitement which he had fomented in Salem, that it was resolved to transport him to England. It was to avoid this that he took his flight in the dead of winter, incurring the severest hardships and privations. We regret that the sufferings of so excellent a man should incidentally or by implication be chargeable upon Winthrop, Cotton, and their associates; but it seems to us that by every fair rule of construction they are to be regarded as directly of his own choice. In a more firmly established community, his erratic course might have been safely tolerated; but it was certainly attended with no little hazard to the harmony and well-being of the infant Colony, and was all the more dangerous on account of his profound sincerity, his undoubted ability, and his acknowledged purity of morals and ardor of devotional spirit. Nor can we trace any proof that he was regarded with unfriendly feelings by the magistrates. His subsequent intercourse with Winthrop was of the most amicable character, and he never failed to bear honorable testimony to the uprightness and personal kindness of his opponents.

Dr. Palfrey, while his sense of historical justice compels him to join issue with the magistrates against Williams, pays a hearty tribute to his Christian conscientiousness and excel-

lence. He was, indeed, a man whose heart was always right. In the vehemence of controversy he was never rancorous; a tone of heavenly sweetness and fervent love pervaded even his invectives and anathemas. But antagonism was the native mood of his intellect; the conflict of minds was his joy; the thorny wreath of protracted martyrdom his crown. In the colony he established he was often at variance — yet never in bitterness — with his associates, and with the divers classes of sectaries who availed themselves of the freedom of conscience he proclaimed. He never laid aside the armor of his warfare. He was at strife even with himself. He was twice re-baptized, and seemed intolerant of repose even in the bosom of the church he had founded. “But the vital part of religion never deserted him. However his theories shifted, he never ceased to be a single-hearted lover of God and men.”

Our discussion has postponed our analysis of Dr. Palfrey's volume. His first chapter is an admirable *résumé* of the physical geography and natural history of New England, and of what is known of the history, habits, culture, and condition of the aboriginal inhabitants. On this last subject he shuns the romance which has too long environed it, and represents the Indians as simply ignorant savages, without eloquence, without treasured and traditional knowledge, possessed only of those rudest arts requisite to bare subsistence, and destitute of those chivalric virtues which have been ignorantly ascribed to them, but of which authentic history bears no record. The next chapter treats of the early voyages and explorations, containing all that is known of the voyages of the Northmen, and of the various explorers from England and Southern Europe who visited or approached our shores. Here, again, there was room for the author's keen criticism in rejecting the fable which has incorporated itself with the very few ascertained facts that connect the Northmen with New England. The Dighton rock he regards as having been inscribed by Indians, and as probably the record of a battle; and, if the depth of the incisions is maintained to indicate the use of iron instruments, he shows that nothing was known of the rock prior to 1680, when the natives had been long in possession of the tools requisite for such an engraving. The round tower at Newport

he is inclined to identify with the mill built by Governor Arnold, and he confronts an engraving of it with that of a mill of similar architecture still standing in Warwickshire, whence the Arnold family are understood to have emigrated. The third chapter contains a condensed and rapid sketch of the history of Puritanism in England, tracing its roots in the sturdy elements of the English character, and its first forth-puttings in the Saxon versions of the Bible during the Heptarchy. Then follows the narrative of the rise of the Scrooby congregation, the annoyances they suffered in their birth-land, their fortunes in the Low Countries, and the causes which induced the emigration of a portion of them to America.

With the fifth chapter commences the history of New England colonization. There is no need that we follow any farther the details of the narrative. It includes in their proper places all the temporary and permanent settlements, to the date of the confederation of 1643. Once and again the author returns to England, to trace the course of events which issued in the colonization of Massachusetts Bay, and to relate the incidents of the Civil War in their bearing on Cisatlantic interests. What constitutes the most valuable characteristic of the work is this close interlacing of the history of the mother country and of the Colonies,—the exhibiting of the successive pulsations of the artery of still undivided though rudely lacerated national life across the ocean,—the juxtaposition of effects with their nearer and remoter causes. At the same time every portion bears indubitable marks of the most thorough first-hand investigation. No accessible source of information has been passed by, or partially drained. We can hardly conceive of any important accession to the materials which Dr. Palfrey has found and employed. His work when completed must take its place as the classic of New England history, and must so continue till new and eventful chapters of our political fortunes, to be developed in coming generations, shall crowd our early annals into a narrower compass.

We can hardly anticipate any diversity of judgment as to the merits of this work. In style, it is above criticism. It bears the trace of no mannerism, unless the slipshod habits of recent authorship make careful finish a mannerism. There is

neither declamation, nor superfluous verbiage, nor impertinent commentary, but continuous and animated narrative, in sentences so perspicuous that the reader's eye is not arrested by their simple beauty, but looks directly through them to the ideas or images they present. The diction, though never turgid and never dull or careless, adapts itself with easy grace to the theme in hand, quickens and glows in the recital of heroic doings and endurings, takes on a keen and subtle edge in the delineation of character, is compressed and unemphatic in the necessary enumeration of mere details, and becomes again full and strong as the main action of the drama is resumed. We have been perpetually reminded, as we have read this volume, of Cicero's definition of the eloquent man, — “*Is, qui poterit parva summisse, modica temperate, magna graviter dicere.*”

Equally unqualified praise is to be awarded to this volume, for the fairness and impartiality of the narrative. There is neither indiscriminate eulogy nor wholesale condemnation. In the portraits of the heroic personages of the history, spots and defects are given with the same fidelity, which cannot do less than justice to a single noble trait or commanding feature. Nor is merited censure left unqualified. There are no marks of favoritism or enmity in the author's own feelings toward the men and parties comprised in his narrative; and this, though it might seem an essential, is a rare quality in an historian. Nine tenths of the great histories that have been written are partisan works, compiled for the special glorification of the representatives of certain opinions or measures; and in their construction the past has not been studied for what it could teach, but ransacked, tortured, and mutilated to furnish precedents for some present mood of popular feeling or phasis of political belief, — for authority in an open controversy, or the confirmation of an individual whim. More entirely free from this reproach the work now under review could not be, were the author divested of all human sympathies; and yet he evinces perpetually the depth and fervor of his sympathies by a diction which indicates not only logical accuracy, but the delicate appreciation and strong inward sense of all that is truly noble and praiseworthy.

This history is, in the best sense of the word, a philosophical

history. The author, indeed, does not propound theories, and then marshal facts so as to confirm and elucidate them. We have hardly ever read a history which had in it so little of express and formal philosophizing. But as in physical phenomena, confused as they seem, there are pervading principles and controlling laws, which need only to be ascertained for the course of nature to flow in unrippled harmony, so in every series of historical events there are certain motive forces whose relative direction and strength it is the province of the historian to develop and exhibit in action. Where these forces are ignored, we have mere annals ; where they are presented in a didactic form, we have political or ethical disquisition ; where they are placed before us in the order and sequences of facts which they shaped and evolved, there alone we have history worthy of the name ; and it is only because the underlying principles of the events included in the narrative have been subjected to rigid philosophical analysis by the writer, that he is able to narrate these events in their causes, dependences, and mutual bearings. We suppose this process to have been most thoroughly wrought in the case in hand, because the work itself manifests its legitimate results without any of its pretence or ostentation.

Dr. Palfrey evidently regards himself as engaged upon the most momentous portion of the history of liberty. He does not consider the settlement of New England as a maritime accident of the seventeenth century, or the character and fortunes of the colonists as moulded and directed by their wilderness experiences. On the other hand, he looks back through antecedent centuries for the providential training of the fathers of this new empire, and finds the elements of their growth and enlargement, of their culminating prosperity on the soil of their first adoption, and of their extended and at times preponderant influence in sister Colonies and States, in the love of freedom and the fear of God which made them exiles. These were the constituents of the Puritan character, born of the word and spirit of the Almighty, baptized in the tears, blood, and fire of weary martyr-ages, matured in the stress of those final exigencies, which left our fathers the alternative of moral and spiritual suicide or self-expatriation. It is these principles

and their workings that our author has presented with vividness and power in every stage of his narrative; and for this pious labor no man could be better fitted than one who has constantly evinced by his own life his determined preference of the right to the expedient, and the fixed resolve to obey God rather than man.

We ought not to omit mention of the valuable illustrative apparatus connected with this volume, in the maps it contains. First, there is a map drawn expressly for this work, which presents New England and the peninsula of the St. Lawrence as far as it was known in 1644, with the positions of the native tribes, and the names of places then in use. Next we have John Smith's map of New England, which is valuable mainly as showing the vagueness of the draftsman's knowledge, and the extent of his ignorance. Finally we have William Wood's map of the southern part of New England, in 1634, which indicates a tolerably accurate conception of the geography of a portion of the coast, but is in the rudest possible style of art.

We regret that we have been able to devote so litt'e time to the analysis of this volume. We delayed the work, in the hope of procuring it to be well and thoroughly done. The aid of contributors themselves thoroughly versed in the minutiae and the recondite lore of New England history will, we trust, do more ample justice to the succeeding volumes, as they appear. Till then, we take leave of the author, with sincere gratitude for what he has given us, and with a keen appetite for what is yet to come.